

Comment on *Acarus putrescentiae* Schrank, 1781 (currently *Tyrophagus putrescentiae*; Acari Acariformes, ACARIDAE): proposed conservation of usage by designation of a replacement neotype

(Case 3501; see BZN 67: 24–27; 71: 99–102)

Johannes Klompen

Department of Evolution, Ecology & Organismal Biology, Ohio State University, 1315 Kinnear Road, Columbus OH 43212, U.S.A. (e-mail: klompen.1@osu.edu)

I express my support for conservation of usage of the name *Tyrophagus putrescentiae*, rather than limiting that name to a rare form from Australia while proposing a new name for the extremely common, cosmopolitan species currently referred to by that name. Not conserving this very well established name in favour of either a rarely (if ever) used senior synonym or a new name, would be highly disruptive and serve very little purpose.

Comments on *Collohmanna* Sellnick, 1922 (Arachnida, Acari, Oribatida): proposed conservation by giving it precedence over the senior subjective synonym *Embolacarus* Sellnick, 1919

(Case 3674; see BZN 72: 33–40)

(1) Gerd Alberti

Zoologisches Institut und Museum, Universität Greifswald, J.-S.-Bach-Str. 11/12, 17487 Greifswald, Germany (e-mail: alberti@uni-greifswald.de)

I strongly support Case 3674 proposed by Norton and Sidorchuk for retaining the generic name *Collohmanna* instead of replacing it with the senior synonym *Embolacarus*. During my admittedly non-taxonomic studies on *Collohmanna gigantea*, I never came across *Embolacarus*. It is evidently hardly used in the literature. The many serious arguments for keeping *Collohmanna* are very convincing in my opinion.

(2) Heather C. Proctor

Department of Biological Sciences, University of Alberta, CW405 Biological Sciences Building, Edmonton, Alberta, Canada T6G 2E9 (e-mail: hproctor@ualberta.ca)

Collohmanna is a well-known name that has appeared in many papers relevant to arachnid systematics and evo-devo in addition to publications that are more mite-specific. The fact that the type (and only) specimen of the species bearing the senior synonym's name has been lost is further reason to allow conservation of *Collohmanna*.

(3) Heinrich Schatz

Institut für Zoologie, Leopold-Franzens-Universität Innsbruck, Technikerstr. 25, A-6020 Innsbruck, Austria (e-mail: heinrich.schatz@uibk.ac.at)

I have worked with oribatid mites for more than 40 years, especially on morphology and taxonomy. The argument given by the authors is consequential and comprehensible. I strongly support this opinion.

(4) Evert E. Lindquist

Canadian National Collection of Insects and Arachnids - Acarology Unit, Science & Technology Branch, Agriculture & Agri-Food Canada, K.W. Neatby Bldg., 960 Carling Avenue, Ottawa ON K1A 0C6, Canada (e-mail: lindquistm@primus.ca)

A strong case has been clearly presented, regarding the wealth and diversity of information from various scientific disciplines under the name *Collohmanna*, such that this name should be conserved over the older name *Embolacarus* if these names include species which are considered to represent the same genus.

With Norton and Sidorchuk proceeding with formally proposing the synonymy of these two genera, I assume that the type-species of *Embolacarus*, *E. pergratus* Sellnick, 1919, would be treated as *Collohmanna pergrata* (Sellnick, 1919), until such time as a taxonomic case is made to justify *pergratus* as representing a separate subgenus, *Collohmanna (Embolacarus) pergrata* (Sellnick), or genus, *Embolacarus pergratus* Sellnick. Thus, I fully support what eventually may be the domino effect of this case if it receives approval by the Commission.

(5) Michael Heethoff

Ecological Networks, Technical University of Darmstadt, Schnittspahnstraße 3, D-64287 Darmstadt, Germany (e-mail: heethoff@bio.tu-darmstadt.de)

Collohmanna is a well-established genus and is commonly known and used in numerous morphological, ecological and molecular studies, whereas *Embolacarus* is only known from the fossil record, and the type (and only specimen) is lost.

Hence, I completely agree with the authors that renaming all extant *Collohmanna* as *Embolacarus* would generate a lot of confusion and long-term inconsistencies in databases and literature citations, while providing hardly useful future perspectives since all extant species belong to the genus *Collohmanna* in the family COLLOHMANNIIDAE. I hope that the Commission is willing to apply Article 23.9.3 to reverse the precedence of *Embolacarus* and *Collohmanna*, and will follow the proposals of Case 3674.

(6) Valerie Behan-Pelletier

Canadian National Collection of Insects & Arachnids, Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada, K.W. Neatby Bldg. 960 Carling Ave., Ottawa, ON K1A 0C6 Canada (e-mail: Valerie.Behan-Pelletier@agr.gc.ca)

As indicated in the application the name *Collohmanna* is very widely used in oribatid citations, whereas the use of *Embolacarus* is both rare and obscure. Furthermore, *Collohmanna* is the name used in research and publications on chemical ecology, ethology and molecular and morphological phylogeny. As with all my colleagues, a distinct habitus and associated information comes to mind when I hear or see the name *Collohmanna*; *Embolacarus* elicits no such association.

Letters in support of Case 3674 stating similar views were received from:

Gerd Weigmann, *Institute for Zoology, Freie Universitaet Berlin, Koenigin Luise Str. 1-3, D-14195 Berlin, Germany (e-mail: weigmann@zedat.fu-berlin.de)*;

Ziemowit Olszanowski, *Department of Animal Taxonomy and Ecology, A. Mickiewicz University, Umultowska 89, 61-614 Poznan, Poland (e-mail: olszanow@amu.edu.pl)*;

Louise Coetzee, *The National Museum, Bloemfontein, P.O. Box 266, Bloemfontein, 9300, South Africa* (e-mail: louise.coetzee@nasmus.co.za);

Johannes Klompen, *Department of Evolution, Ecology & Organismal Biology, Ohio State University, 1315 Kinnear Road, Columbus OH 43212, U.S.A.*
(e-mail: klompen.1@osu.edu)

Comment on the proposed precedence of *Prionocerus bicolor* Redtenbacher, 1868 (Insecta, Coleoptera, CLEROIDEA, PRIONOCERIDAE) over *P. pertii* Laporte de Castelnau, 1836

(Case 3511; BZN 67: 137–139; 70: 204)

Michael A. Ivie

Montana Entomology Collection, Marsh Lab, Rm 50, Montana State University, Bozeman, Montana, 59717, U.S.A. (e-mail: mivie@montana.edu)

I strongly support the proposal of Geiser in Case 3511, to continue prevailing usage of the name *Prionocerus bicolor* Redtenbacher, 1868 over the forgotten senior synonym *P. pertii* Laporte de Castelnau, 1836. This is perhaps the most common and widely recognized species in this group, and a change of the name serves no purpose whatsoever. The number of published usages required for automatic suppression should be seen only as a way to lessen the need for submission of clear cases to the Commission, who are overburdened as it is. However, lack of that arbitrary number of references should be seen not as a lack of reason for the action, but simply as a chance for review of the Case. In this Case, I would like to argue that stability is the goal, and that approval of the Case best serves stability. To not approve this Case would require a change to a name no one knows, no one uses and that would require all links to knowledge already recorded be accessed through the junior name anyway. I strongly beseech the Commission to approve this petition.

Comment on the proposed precedence of *Maculinea van Eecke*, 1915 over *Phengaris Doherty*, 1891 (Lepidoptera, LYCAENIDAE)

(Case 3508; see BZN 67: 129–132; 245, 315–319; 68: 292–293; 70: 52–53; 250–251)

Stanislav K. Korb

Nizhnii Novgorod State University, Nizhnii Novgorod, 603000 Russia
(e-mail: stanislavkorb@list.ru)

I am not supporting Case 3508 for the following reasons:

1. *Maculinea* Van Eecke, 1915 is a generic-group name with type species *Papilio alcon* [Denis & Schiffermüller], 1775 and, in 'old' papers, also includes the following species: *M. arion* (Linnaeus, 1758), *M. nausithous* (Bergsträsser, 1779), *M. cyanecula* (Eversmann, 1848), *M. arionides* (Staudinger, 1887), *M. teleius* (Bergsträsser, 1779) and *M. kurentzovi* Sibatani, Saigusa & Hirowatari, 1994, as well as some taxa of uncertain status. All these species have a Palaearctic-only distribution.

2. *Phengaris* Doherty, 1891 is a generic-group name with type species *Lycaena atroguttata* Oberthür, 1876 and, in 'old' papers, also includes the species *P. albida* Leech, 1893 and *P. daitozana* Wileman, 1911. All these species have a Palaetropic-only distribution.

3. Both names are available and represent two natural groups of two different biomes, occupying similar habitats. They have similar external features because of convergent evolution; genital features are similar because of their conservative organisation in this very young group (for generic differences in blue butterflies male genitalia see e.g. Zhdanko, 1983). Molecular similarity can be also explained by the group's young age.

4. I revised the Palaearctic part of this group (Korb, 2011) and designated name-bearing types, including the neotype of *M. alcon*. The representatives of 'true' *Phengaris* have also been comparatively studied. In fact we have two isolated groups of closely related organisms. According to this logic both generic group names should stay in use in zoological nomenclature and systematics. Of course these taxa are subjective, and this is one more reason not to make changes to the nomenclature too quickly. We must predict the possibility of future changes in systematics, and to preserve its stability we should just follow the Code's requirements and only use the Commission's power in extraordinary cases. Case 3508 is far from extraordinary. If the matter can be easily solved by using the Code, I do not see any point in asking the Commission to use its power.

5. Both names, for example, can easily be used as subgenera, which is probably the wisest taxonomic course that can be taken in this case.

6. As it was shown several times, both groups form the same cluster on phylogenetic trees (Fric et al., 2007) and so, they could be considered synonyms. According to Article 23 of the Code we should just use the Principles of Coordination and Priority to treat both names as synonyms, as we normally do in many cases without affecting the stability of nomenclature at all, which is one more reason to reject this proposal.

Additional references

- Fric, Z., Wahlberg, N., Pech, P. & Zrzavý, J. 2007. Phylogeny and classification of the *Phengaris-Maculinea* clade (Lepidoptera: Lycaenidae): total evidence and phylogenetic species concepts. *Systematic Entomology*, **32**: 558–567.
- Korb, S.K. 2011. A review of subgenus *Maculinea* van Eecke, 1915 of the genus *Phengaris* Doherty, 1891 (Lepidoptera: Lycaenidae) of Palaearctic fauna. *Eversmannia*, **27–28**: 22–46.
- Zhdanko, A.B. 1983. Determination keys of the blue butterflies (Lepidoptera, Lycaenidae) of the USSR fauna. *Entomologicheskoe Obozrenie*, **62**(1): 131–152.

Comment on *Anolis chlorocyanus* Dumeril & Bibron, 1837 and *Anolis coelestinus* Cope, 1862 (Reptilia, Squamata): proposed conservation of the specific names and designation of a neotype for *A. chlorocyanus*

(Case 3672; see BZN 72: 45–49)

Mark J. Grygier

Lake Biwa Museum, Oroshimo 1091, Kusatsu, Shiga, 525–0001, Japan
(e-mail: grygier@lbm.go.jp)

Paragraph 4 of Case 3672 provides a list of 'the diagnostic traits of the taxonomic species [*Anolis*] *coelestinus* of current usage', but the authors cite no original source. Is this perhaps a newly compiled list abstracted from the authors' upcoming

monograph? Conversely, Paragraph 8 says that the proposed neotype 'represents the taxonomic species *A. chlorocyamus* of current usage.' This is an unsupported assertion inasmuch as no similar list of diagnostic traits for this latter species is provided or referenced; only the vague comparative diagnosis of Barbour (1935) is quoted. There is also no demonstration of how well the proposed neotype exhibits those traits. The nice photos in Fig. 1 probably do show the traits in question, but what precisely they are is a mystery. Any ordinary proposal of a neotype must address in a satisfactory way all the 'qualifying conditions' of Article 75.3 of the Code, but this Case neglects Articles 75.3.2 and 75.3.4. Although the Commission has the power to endorse the present neotype nomination despite the missing information, I urge the authors to supplement their application with a statement that explicitly and fully addresses Articles 75.3.2 and 75.3.4, and also mention the source(s) of the specific diagnoses used.